



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/722,507	11/28/2003	Tung-Hung Tsai	MR3315-7	7661
4586	7590	09/09/2005	EXAMINER	
ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE 3458 ELLICOTT CENTER DRIVE-SUITE 101 ELLICOTT CITY, MD 21043			JOERGER, KAITLIN S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3653	

DATE MAILED: 09/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

kc

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/722,507	TSAI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Kaitlin S. Joerger	3653

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 November 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: On page 3 the applicant begins describe figure 2 and the elements shown in figure 2. The applicant states that figure 2 depicts a wafer 10, however, reference numeral 10 is not shown in the figure. The examiner is unclear whether the picture is depicting the wafer, 10, of the wafer film 11, underneath the chip 21.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 4, 6, and 7-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 4 and 10 recite the limitation "said pre-sorting specialized bin" in lines 3 and 2, respectively. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 6 recites the limitation "the chipping on the blue film" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Art Unit: 3653

Claim 7 recites the limitation "a second platform providing the place" in 8. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 12 recites the limitation "the blue film" in 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-4 and 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by

Gianpaolo et al.

Gianpaolo et al. teaches a chip sorting method and apparatus. The chip sorting apparatus comprises a first platform, a positioning axis, having an end for lift and down, a first robotic arm having a probe, a second robotic arm having a sucking mechanism, and a second platform providing a place for the chip. The apparatus lifts up the positioning axis of the first platform, uses the first probe of the robotic arm to inspect the chip, uses the second robotic arm to suck the chip and place it on the second platform. The second platform includes a specialized bin and the tests include an electric test for inspecting the chip. The apparatus relies on the test to place the chip in the specialized bin, see columns 3 and 4.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Art Unit: 3653

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5, 6, 11, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gianpaolo et al. in view of Olson et al.

Gianpaolo et al. does not teach a method or apparatus that includes pre-cutting the wafer for dividing the chip and processing the chip after cutting. Olson et al. does teach, in column 1, lines 10+ that is known in the industry to cut a strip of semiconductor apparatuses into individual ones and sort and transfer each one. He further teaches a method and apparatus for cutting and sorting individual semiconductor apparatuses.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the step of pre-cutting the semiconductor devices taught by Olson et al. with the chip sorting method and apparatus of Gianpaolo et al. if one desired to be able to test and sort each individual chip, rather than be limited to only sorting the wafer, and therefore achieve a more accurate degree of sorting.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See the included PTO-892 form for other pertinent patents and publications.

Art Unit: 3653

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kaitlin S. Joerger whose telephone number is 571-272-6938. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Donald Walsh can be reached on 571-272-6944. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ksj
2 September 2005


DONALD P. WALSH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600